



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/601,806	11/30/2000	Breda Cullen	JIM-454	3588
7590 12/15/2003				
Audley A Ciamporcero Jr One Johnson & Johnson Plaza New Brunswick, NJ 08933-7003				
			EXAMINER MOHAMED, ABDEL A	
			ART UNIT 1653	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

### Application No.

09/601,806

### Applicant(s)

CULLEN ET AL.

### Examiner

Abdel A. Mohamed

### Art Unit

1653

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 September 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_. 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### **ACKNOWLEDGMENT FOR COMMUNICATION, PRIORITY, IDS, STATUS OF THE APPLICATION AND CLAIMS**

1. The communication filed 9/25/03 is acknowledged, entered and considered. Applicant's request for regular continued prosecution (RCE) and in response Applicant's attachment of the Office Action of 3/26/03 (Paper No. 8) and requirement of additional time to review the office action is noted. However, the criteria for filing RCE are:
  - a) the RCE should be submitted after a final rejection,
  - b) the submission may be a previously filed amendments(s) after final rejection and/or an amendment accompanying the RCE as set forth in 37 CFR 1.114,
  - c) a submission may include an information disclosure statement, an amendment to the written description, claims, or drawings, new arguments, or new evidence in support of patentability, and
  - d) if a reply to the Office action is outstanding the submission must meet the reply requirements of 37 CFR 1.111.

Thus, the request for filing RCE has not fulfilled the required criteria as stated above, hence, the request for filing RCE is inappropriate. Therefore, the previous Office Action is reiterated and made Final.

2. This application is filed under 35 U.S.C. 371 on 11/30/00 having a filing date of 12/6/1999 of PCT/GB99/04094. Acknowledgment is made of Applicant's claim for priority based on United Kingdom Application Number GB 9826897.2 having a filing

date 12/7/1998. Receipt is acknowledged of Certified Copy of United Kingdom Application Number GB 9826897.2 and papers submitted under U.S.C. § 119, which papers have been placed of record in the file. Also, the Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) and Form PTO-1449 filed 8/3/00 are acknowledged, entered and considered. Claims 1-33 are present for examination.

### **ABSTRACT MISSING**

3. This application does not contain an abstract of the disclosure as required by 37 CFR 1.72(b). An abstract on a separate sheet is required.

### **OBJECTIONS TO TRADEMARKS AND THEIR USE**

4. The use of the trademarks "INTERCEED®", "SURGICEL®", "STERAD®", "FORMOL®", "BIOLINX®" and "TRITON®" have been noted in this application. Although, the use of trademarks are permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in a manner which might adversely affect its validity as trademarks.

Further, the specification, which specifies the generic terminology should include, published product information sufficient to show that the generic terminology or the generic description are inherent in the article referred by the trademarks. These description requirements are made because the nature and composition of articles denoted by trademarks can change and affect the adequacy of the disclosure.

**OBJECTION TO IMPROPER MULTIPLE DEPENDENT CLAIMS**

5. Claims 7-22 and 27-31 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim should refer to other claims in the alternative only and/or cannot depend from any other dependent claims. See MPEP § 608.01(n). However, the claims been treated on the merits and interpreted as dependent solely from the first recited claim from which the claims depend.

**CLAIMS REJECTION-35 U.S.C. § 112<sup>2nd</sup> PARAGRAPH**

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The term "mixtures thereof" after Markush format as recited in claims 1, 4, 23 and 32 makes the claims indefinite because in regard to claims 1, 23 and 32, the polysaccharides selected have 4 components, namely, cellulose derivatives, chitin, chitosans and galactomannans, and it is not clear how these 4 components are mixed with each other. The specification or the claims fail to provide guidance as how and/or which components are mixed with the amounts necessary to mix them against each other in the manner claimed.

With respect to claim 4, eight growth factors are recited in the claim and it is not understood how these 8 components would result in a sterile composition having mixtures thereof for the reasons discussed above. Thus, since the metes and bounds of "mixtures thereof" are not set forth in the disclosure or in the claims, deletion of the term "mixtures thereof" would obviate this rejection.

Further, in claim 4, there is inconsistency in the recitation "mixtures thereof" and "growth factor" because "mixtures" is plural and "growth factor" is singular.

Claims 7-22 and 27-31 are indefinite for being improper multiple dependent claims because a multiple dependent claim is supposed to depend in the alternative only. Also, a multiple dependent claim shall not serve as a basis for any other multiple dependent claims, either directly or indirectly. These limitations help to avoid undue confusion in determining how many prior claims are actually referred to a multiple dependent claim. Thus, claims 7-22 and 27-31 are improper multiple dependent claims for the above reasons.

Claims 9, 10 and 21 recite the acronym "ORC" and "nORC" (claim 9). Use of the full terminology at least in the first occurrence would obviate this rejection.

### **CLAIMS REJECTION-35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) a patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watt et al. (GB Patent No. 2,314,842) taken with Orsolini et al. (GB Patent No. 2,257,909) or Cini et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,705,485) or Finkenaur (U.S. Patent no. 4,717,717).

The reference of Watt et al. (GB Patent No. 2,314,842) discloses like the instantly claimed invention a sterile composition comprising a complex of a therapeutic peptide and polysaccharide and to a method of preparation the sterile composition thereof (See e.g., abstract). The reference clearly discloses the preparation and uses of complexes of structural proteins such as collagen, fibronectin, fibrin, laminin, elastin, growth factors with polysaccharides such as oxidized regenerated cellulose (ORC), cellulose derivatives, chitin, chitosans, etc. at the weight ratio of protein to ORC from 1:99.99 to 99.99:1 (See e.g., page 3, lines 12-29), wherein the complexes are useful for wound dressing and the like, and exhibit useful binding to growth factor particularly to

platelet derived growth factor (PDGF) (See e.g., page 5, lines 7-22). The reference also teaches a process for the preparation of the complex by providing an aqueous dispersion of a protein; and/immersing or dispersing OCR in the aqueous dispersion; following by removing water from the aqueous dispersion to leave a material comprising protein complexed with oxidized regenerated cellulose (ORC) (See e.g., page 6, lines 6-21). The water can be removed from the aqueous dispersion by filtration, evaporation, or freeze-drying (lyophilization) or solvent-drying to produce the material in the form of a sponge (See e.g., abstract; page 1, lines 3-6; page 2, lines 25 to page 5, lines 22; page 6, lines 6-29; Figures 2-3; Example 4, claims 14, 23 and 26). Thus, the reference clearly teaches the preparation that may be used for topical administration wherein the composition is sterilized prior to administration as the therapeutic peptide are stabilized against decomposition during sterilization by being formulated with biopolymer such as structural protein or polyanionic polysaccharide.

The reference differs from claims 1-33 in not teaching a) sterilization with ionizing radiation, b) wherein the peptide comprises a growth factor having human mitogenic or angiogenic activity, c) the complex further comprises a free radical scavenger, and d) wherein the complex is administered intravenously. Although, the primary reference of Watt et al. clearly teaches the use of complexes for wound dressing and the like which is applied topically in animals including humans, the complexes are sterilized since they are applied *in vivo*, however, Orsolini et al. (GB Patent No. 2,257,909) clearly disclose the sterilization of complexes comprising a therapeutic peptide and a polysaccharide by gamma ray sterilization and the suspension of the complexes in an appropriate sterile

vehicle (See e.g., page 8, last paragraph to page 9, first paragraph; and Example 7). Further, the reference of Cini et al.(U.S. Patent No. 5,705,485) on col. 1, lines 63-66 discloses an aqueous gel formulations for topical or incisional wound healing comprises an effective wound healing amount of a polypeptide growth factor having human mitogenic or angiogenic activity. Furthermore, the reference of Finkenaur (U.S. Patent No. 4,717,717) teaches the use of a stabilized medicinal complex comprising a therapeutic peptide and a polysaccharide and wherein the complex further comprises as an additional agent anti-oxidants (i.e., free radical scavenger) and useful for in eye drop formulation, salves for wound healing, gel formulations, foams, and the like (See e.g., col. 3, lines 18-32).

Thus, in view of the above, given the teachings of the primary reference, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated at the time the invention was made to adapt the above scheme of sterilizing with ionizing radiation, or use of a peptide which comprises a growth factor having human mitogenic or angiogenic activity and sterile composition further comprising a free radical in a sterile formulation comprising a complex of therapeutic peptide and a polysaccharide as taught by the secondary references. Further, such features are known or suggested in the art (particularly, the sterilization by gamma rays, use of a growth factor having human mitogenic or angiogenic activity and use of a radical scavenger) as seen in the secondary references, and including such features into the method and/or composition/product of primary reference would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to obtain the known and recognized functions and advantages thereof.

With respect to claim 17, the claim is directed to intravenous administration, however, each of the prior art teaches the topical administration of the same complex for the same purpose of treating animals including humans; thus, in view of this, it is the Examiner's position that the selection of suitable route of administration is deemed to be within the scope of those skilled in the art to which this invention pertains, and as such, one of ordinary skill in the art would easily adjust the route of administration depending on the specific agent in question (i.e. if the formulation is liquid or solid or semi-solid or powder, etc.), conditions to be treated (i.e. skin versus internal, etc.) and the amount of the agent to administered.

With respect to claim 22, the claim is in product-by-process format and as such, it is the novelty and patentability of the instantly claimed product that need be established and not the recited process steps, In re Brown, 173 USPQ 685 (CCPA 1972); In re Wertheim, 191 USPQ (CCPA 1976). Further, the prior art described the product as old, In re Best, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977); (See MPEP 706.03 [e]). Hence, the burden of proving that the process limitation makes a different product is shifted to the Applicants, In re Fitzgerald, 205 USPQ 594.

Therefore, in view of the above and in view of the combined teachings of the prior art, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ a sterile composition sterilized with ionizing radiation comprising a complex of a therapeutic peptide and polysaccharide and a method of preparation the sterile composition thereof in the manner claimed in claims 1-33, absent of providing sufficient objective factual evidence or unexpected results to the contrary.

**ACTION IS FINAL**

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

**CONCLUSION AND FUTURE CORRESPONDENCE**


9. No clam is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Abdel A. Mohamed whose telephone number is (703) 308-3966. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Low, can be reached on (703) 308-2923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306 for regular communication and (703) 305-7401 for After Final communication.

Art Unit: 1653

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

 Mohamed/AAM

December 5, 2003

  
CHRISTOPHER S. F. LOW  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600